



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It will appear from this that it would be a very delicate matter indeed to discriminate between the degrees of responsibility attached by the two writers to Bismarck. The most direct and serious disagreement between them is with regard to the factor of public feeling in France and Germany. Zwiedineck-Südenhorst declares that the whole French people must bear the responsibility, no serious effort having been made in any quarter to prevent the war; while Denis maintains that the German historians who say that French public feeling wanted war deceive themselves "volontairement ou non". With regard to German feeling, "die laute Zustimmung zur That von Ems" (p. 447) is to the Austrian a holy emotion, which he is proud to reflect that the Deutsch-Oesterreicher shared; to Denis the German outcry was due largely to the production by the university teaching of a youth that "n'a qu'un credo: la conviction de la supériorité de la vertu et de la science germaniques; qu'une religion: la force; qu'un besoin: la domination" (p. 471).

Neither of these books can be said to add much to our knowledge of the period, and it is not to be expected that they should. The careful reader will not be always in agreement with either, but will acknowledge both to be good summaries, useful especially for the general reader and in showing the student the present state of our information in this field. Neither claims to be presenting a definitive history, and both seem in consequence to feel more or less of irresponsibility as to the expression of personal views. Denis is on the whole quite as trustworthy as Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, and is much more brilliant and suggestive; there are more gaps, however, in his narrative, and he does not follow the political development as carefully. Unhappily neither volume is provided with an index.

VICTOR COFFIN.

A History of Modern England. By HERBERT PAUL. In five volumes. Volume V. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1906. Pp. vi, 405.)

THE fifth and last volume of Mr. Paul's *History of Modern England* begins with June 8, 1885, "a memorable day in English history . . . from [which] all subsequent events in this History take in some degree their colour." It was, in fact, the day on which Mr. Gladstone announced to the queen his defeat in the momentous general election of that year. The ensuing narrative concludes with Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's "shut[ting] up his box with a snap" (p. 268), resigning his office, and thus forcing the general election of 1895, which, like that of a decade before, brought defeat to the Liberal party. The preceding volume concerned itself with Imperialism and Ireland. The present volume is dominated by the course of the Irish question in English politics by which it first disrupted and then overthrew the Liberal party. It is, in brief, the tragedy of Home Rule, and it ends in doubt if not in despair. The only relief comes in the suggestions which abound, that

the final solution was not found in 1895, nor the Liberal cause forever lost. Coming events cast their shadows over many pages, and it is much to be hoped that Mr. Paul may at no distant time write the story of the rehabilitation of Liberalism in the years from 1895 to 1906, and not leave us and the party at its overthrow, as he insists on doing.

The qualities of the earlier volumes naturally characterize the present performance, though the rapidity which marked the earlier work at times descends here almost to hurry. More than ever is it evident that Mr. Paul is a journalist. His work, clever and useful as it is, has no claim to be judged by the standards of de la Gorce or Rhodes. Whatever it gains in vividness, direct and striking statement, and that evanescent quality known as brilliance, by contrast with them it loses in the surer if less dazzling results of greater pains and patience. This is not saying that it is not excellent of its kind. But its kind is not that of de la Gorce and Rhodes. This is particularly apparent in two directions. The first is that Mr. Paul lives so strongly in the present that its influence tinges his narrative in many places, as for instance in the account of the Oxford meeting of the Conservative Association and its tariff reform resolution of 1887 (pp. 112-114). The second is the often-noted habit of judging individuals frankly and unashamed. It is his manifest intention to be fair, and in the main he is so. But he writes largely from the standpoint of a Gladstonian Liberal, and he is at times somewhat severe on Lord Salisbury and in particular on Mr. Chamberlain. Of the latter, his highest encomium is that he was "an adept in the arts of the caucus and the lobby" (pp. 63-64), while his opinion of Lord Salisbury (p. 115) is somewhat less favorable in certain directions than Bismarck's classic characterization. With respect to men outside the sphere of British politics, Bismarck's name offers a further illustration of the fact noted before, that in the case of matters and men apart from the direct current of English affairs there is apparent a certain superficiality of judgment. In the present instance, the statement of the position and activities of Germany and her chancellor in the partition of Africa (pp. 121-123, 131) is, at least, inadequate.

In the way of bibliography, Mr. Paul has been fortunate in having Mr. Churchill's life of his father to use. But this book, with Morley's *Gladstone*, O'Brien's *Parnell*, Fitzmaurice's *Granville*, Clayden's *England under the Coalition*, Lyall's *Dufferin*, and the *Times*, are literally the only sources quoted in the foot-notes of his main narrative, and most of these appear but once. Morley's *Gladstone*, of course, remains the mainstay of the book. It would be as absurd to imagine that these were all the works consulted by Mr. Paul as to judge his book by its foot-notes or bibliography; but these matters, with others in the present volume, seem to betray increasing haste or weariness, which the cleverness cannot wholly conceal. In this connection the proportions of the volume are interesting. The period from 1885 to 1890 receives 182 pages, that from 1890 to 1895 ninety-two. The rest of the book is made up,

first, of a brief chapter on "The New Unionism"; second, one on "The Triumph of Ritualism"; third, eight pages of "Conclusion"; fourth, an index to the five volumes. The weakest part of the whole work is the conclusion, and while the chapters on Unionism and Ritualism have a certain interest and importance, the whole group seems rather designed to make up, with the index, the necessary four hundred odd pages than for any more useful purpose.

The present volume, whose events coincide more or less accurately with an equally strenuous period in our own history, naturally suggests many parallels between American and English politics, and nowhere more than in a comparison of campaign amenities. Mr. Paul rather understates than overstates the zeal of the lady who compared Mr. Gladstone to Judas. It was, she said, flattery to compare the disestablisher of the Irish church to Judas. One on this side of the water is not impressed by Mr. Paul's comparison of the violence of the Home Rule campaign with the "academic calmness" of the bimetallism controversy. But in "Home Rule, Rome Rule", we come into instant touch with our similarly effective alliteration of "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion." Though we have probably never had a statesman whose eye was permanently injured like Mr. Gladstone's by the playful practice of using candidates for targets after the English fashion, we have, on the other hand, equaled the famous unparliamentary performance here recorded, which took place on the floor of the Commons at the end of July, 1892.

Finally, it would be unfair to conclude a review of this work without a further reference to Mr. Paul's cleverness. It is not history, but it is amusing, and in it lies perhaps the only method of lighting up the drearier stretches of a century which has at times a tendency to become parliamentary and prosy, commonplace and unromantic. There may be another means than the injection of Mr. Bernard Shaw's methods to attract the average reader to the contemplation of essentially good and useful but essentially dull reforms, but it has not been discovered. We may not be profoundly illuminated by the description of M. Waddington (p. 238) as a man "who had been at Rugby and Cambridge, but was nevertheless a [profound] scholar", but we are tempted to read on. The serious-minded might take exception to the statement concerning the result of the 1892 general election (p. 233), that "One result of not letting Ireland govern herself was that she governed England"; but it expresses a certain amount of shrewd truth, as much perhaps as an epigram can, and whets the appetite for more, beyond mountains of blue-books and miles of statistics. The statement (p. 259) regarding the retirement of the Liberal whip, Mr. Marjoribanks, immediately after that of Mr. Gladstone, that "the crook disappeared with the shepherd", is not perhaps so felicitous, save to the exceptionally light-minded. Entertainment is not, obviously, the chief duty of the historian, but it is not inadmissible to attract men by such means to the pursuit of serious matters for their own enlightenment and the good of the state. And we

have to thank Mr. Paul for a book which, if not profound, has at least the merits of putting great matters clearly, attractively, and simply, of being at once instructive and entertaining.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Philippine Islands. By JOHN FOREMAN. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. Pp. xxii, 668.)

PROBABLY no other writer on the Philippines has been so often quoted in the United States since 1898 as John Foreman. Certainly no other has so often been made sponsor for garbled versions of Philippine history and half-truths or downright inaccuracies regarding Philippines and Filipinos.

For a number of years, off and on, Mr. Foreman lived in and travelled about the Philippines in behalf of British manufacturers of machinery for tropical agriculture. Thus he naturally gained expert information about Philippine resources and some general information about the people and their government. Before bringing out his treatise, first in Hong-Kong, then in London, in 1889-1890, he apparently "read up" at random in Philippine history, relying chiefly upon Friar Concepción's tedious and not always reliable chronicles for the early history and on miscellaneous fragmentary writings for the rest—his sources are rarely indicated. With a tendency to launch suppositions as facts where data were wanting, a lack of sympathy with the Spanish viewpoint, ignorance of Spanish history and colonial administration, and prejudice against the friars in the Philippines, the book he produced was a jumble of facts and fancies, of information and misinformation. This as to its historical pretensions; the chapters on agriculture, etc., and on the author's experiences, though by no means devoid of inaccuracies, were more valuable.

Except for a translation of Jagor in 1875, no treatise on the Philippines had appeared in English since Bowring's of 1859. On the strength of the reputation earned by his book, Foreman was summoned to give information and advice to the American peace commission at Paris in 1898—advice which reads very strangely if paralleled with his contributions to periodicals in 1900 and thereafter. While discussion of the Philippine question was at its height in 1899, another edition of Foreman's book of 1890 appeared, with some new chapters giving a very fragmentary and incorrect account of the Tagalog rebellion of 1896-1898. To this account he has in the 1906 edition, under review, made various additions, with inaccuracies as numerous and as glaring as his original errors, which, moreover, for the most part remain uncorrected. There follow some two hundred new pages devoted to a review of the events of American occupation, 1898-1905, and a description of American government, in military and civil phases, and its workings.

Before taking up these new portions of the book, something should be